

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JONATHAN COLLIN AUTRY,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
SCOTT JONES, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-00554-TLN-JDP (PC)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On October 3, 2023, I informed plaintiff that his second amended complaint was unsigned, *see* ECF No. 28, and that he would need to re-file a signed complaint within thirty days. ECF No. 29. To date, plaintiff has not filed a signed complaint or otherwise responded to the October 3, 2023 order.

To manage its docket effectively, the court requires litigants to meet certain deadlines. The court may impose sanctions, including dismissing a case, for failure to comply with its orders or local rules. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; *Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. *See* *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

I will give plaintiff a chance to explain why the court should not dismiss the case for his

1 failure to file a signed complaint. Plaintiff's failure to respond to this order will constitute a  
2 failure to comply with a court order and will result in a recommendation that this action be  
3 dismissed. Accordingly, plaintiff is ordered to show cause within twenty-one days why this case  
4 should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders. Should  
5 plaintiff wish to continue with this lawsuit, he shall file, within twenty-one days, a signed  
6 complaint.

7

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9

10 Dated: November 30, 2023

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEREMY D. PETERSON  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE